

Application No. 09/735,751
Amendment dated February 7, 2006
Reply to Office Action of September 13, 2005

REMARKS

Status Of Application

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application; the status of the claims is as follows:

Claims 1-6, 10-12, and 14-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,790,193 to Ohmori (“Ohmori”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,686,958 B1 to Watanabe et al. (“Watanabe”).

Claims 7-9, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ohmori.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 5, 7-14, 18, and 20 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. These changes do not introduce any new matter.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection

The rejection of claims 1-6, 10-12, and 14-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Ohmori in view of Watanabe, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, that “the information is displayed adjacent to each image.” That is, each image and the information indicating where the image is stored are displayed adjacent to each other. This amendment is supported, for example, by Figs. 9, 13, 14, and 19-21. In contrast, Watanabe only teaches displaying images in groups based on where they are stored and putting the information on where the group of images are stored in the title bar of the window containing the group of images. Ohmori is silent with regard to displaying information indicating where an image is stored.

Application No. 09/735,751
Amendment dated February 7, 2006
Reply to Office Action of September 13, 2005

Thus, Ohmori and Watanabe fail to disclose, teach, or otherwise suggest displaying with *each* image information about where the corresponding image data is stored. It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the combination of Ohmori and Watanabe is distinguished by claim 1 as well as by claims 2-4 which depend therefrom.

Claim 5 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, “a display controller which causes said display to display essentially simultaneously and adjacent to each other a first image based on the image data read from the first recording medium and a second image based on the image data read from the second recording medium.” That is, images from two different storage media are displayed adjacent to each other. Support for the amendment may be found, for example, in Figs. 13, 14, and 19-21. In contrast, Watanabe teaches that images stored on separate storage media are to be segregated and displayed in distinct groups. See Fig. 5. Ohmori is silent with regard to displaying images based on image data from multiple storage media. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Ohmori and Watanabe fail to disclose, teach, or otherwise suggest all features of amended claim 5, and that the combination is distinguished by claim 5 as well as by claim 6 which depends therefrom.

Claim 10 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, a display controller that causes the display “to display the information that specifies the recording medium from which the image data was read adjacent to the image based on the image data.” As provided above regarding claims 1 and 5, this feature of claim 10 is not disclosed, taught, or otherwise suggested by either Ohmori or Watanabe. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of these two references is distinguished by claim 10.

Claim 11 has been amended to require a camera that is operable in first mode for displaying images one at a time and a second mode for displaying images from multiple storage media at the same time so that they are adjacent. It is respectfully submitted that neither Ohmori or Watanabe disclose, teach, or otherwise suggest a camera have the claimed operating modes. Furthermore as provided above regarding claims 1 and 5,

Application No. 09/735,751
Amendment dated February 7, 2006
Reply to Office Action of September 13, 2005

displaying images from different media adjacent to each other is not disclosed, taught, or otherwise suggested by either Ohmori or Watanabe. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of these two references is distinguished by claim 11.

Claim 12 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, a step of “displaying a first image based on the image data read from the first recording medium and a second image based on the image data read from the second recording medium, essentially simultaneously and adjacent to each other.” As provided above regarding claims 1 and 5, neither Ohmori or Watanabe disclose, teach, or otherwise suggest displaying images from different storage media adjacent to each other. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of these two references is distinguished by claim 12.

Claim 14 has been amended to recite a display controller operable in “a second mode in which two images based on image data from different recording media are displayed concurrently and adjacent to each other.” As provided above regarding claims 1 and 5, neither Ohmori or Watanabe disclose, teach, or otherwise suggest displaying images from different storage media adjacent to each other. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of these two references is distinguished by claim 14, as well as by claims 15-17 which depend therefrom.

Claim 18 has been amended to recite “a display controller . . . which causes said display to display essentially simultaneously, and adjacent to each other, a first image based on the image data read from the first recording medium and a second image based on the image data read from the second recording medium.” As provided above regarding claims 1 and 5, neither Ohmori or Watanabe disclose, teach, or otherwise suggest displaying images from different storage media adjacent to each other. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of these two references is distinguished by claim 18, as well as by claim 19 which depends therefrom.

Claim 20 has been amended to recite a step of “displaying an image based on the determined camera display mode, the image data, and information that specifies the

Application No. 09/735,751
Amendment dated February 7, 2006
Reply to Office Action of September 13, 2005

recording medium from which the image data was read such that an image based on the image data is displayed adjacent to the information that specifies the recording medium from which the image data was read.” As provided above regarding claim 1, neither Ohmori or Watanabe disclose, teach, or otherwise suggest displaying adjacent to each other an image and information about which storage media the image come from. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of these two references is distinguished by claim 20.

Claim 21 has been amended to recite a step of “displaying, responsive to the camera being in the dual image display mode, a first image based on the image data read from the first recording medium and a second image based on the image data read from the second recording medium, essentially simultaneously, and adjacent to each other.” As provided above regarding claim 1, neither Ohmori or Watanabe disclose, teach, or otherwise suggest displaying images from different storage media adjacent to each other. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of these two references is distinguished by claim 18, as well as by claim 19 which depends therefrom.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-6, 10-12, and 14-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohmori in view of Watanabe et al, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejection

The rejection of claims 7-9, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ohmori, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Claim 7 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, “a user input for selecting a rule from a plurality of rules defining a sequence of the images.” It is respectfully submitted Ohmori does not disclose a user input for selecting a rule from a plurality of rules defining a sequence of the images. Ohmori discloses that the user can select an image by operation of the advance and reverse buttons, but does not provide any disclosure as to the sequence

Application No. 09/735,751
Amendment dated February 7, 2006
Reply to Office Action of September 13, 2005

in which the images are displayed or how the sequence is determined. In particular, the “advance” and “reverse” buttons shown in Fig. 7 are not used to select a rule defining a sequence, but only to move to the next or previous image in some unspecified sequence. It is respectfully submitted that because Ohmori fails to disclose the user input of claim 7, the reference is distinguished by claim 7, as well as claims 8 and 9 which depend therefrom.

Claim 13 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, a step of “accepting a selection of a rule from a plurality of rules for ordering a plurality of items of image data stored in two or more recording media.” As provided above regarding claim 7, this feature of claim 13 is not disclosed by Ohmori. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the cited reference is distinguished by claim 13.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 7-9, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ohmori, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Wherefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and an early reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

This Amendment does not increase the number of independent claims, does not increase the total number of claims, and does not present any multiple dependency claims. Accordingly, no fee based on the number or type of claims is currently due. However, if a fee, other than the issue fee, is due, please charge this fee to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260.

If an extension of time is required to enable this document to be timely filed and there is no separate Petition for Extension of Time filed herewith, this document is to be

Application No. 09/735,751
Amendment dated February 7, 2006
Reply to Office Action of September 13, 2005

construed as also constituting a Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for a period of time sufficient to enable this document to be timely filed.

Any other fee required for such Petition for Extension of Time and any other fee required by this document pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17, other than the issue fee, and not submitted herewith should be charged to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260. Any refund should be credited to the same account.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Michael J. DeHaemer
Registration No. 39,164
Attorney for Applicants

MJD/lb:jkk
SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP
717 N. Harwood, Suite 3400
Dallas, Texas 75201
Direct: (214) 981-3335
Main: (214) 981-3300
Facsimile: (214) 981-3400
February 7, 2006

DAI 335297v.6